

**CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT**

ENDC/PV.162
31 January 1964
ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SECOND MEETING

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

MAR 19 1964

DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 31 January 1964, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. E. de SANTIAGO

(Mexico)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. J. de CASTRO

Mr. E. HOSANNAH

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. LUKANOV

Mr. G. GHELEV

Mr. D. TEHOV

Mr. G. YANKOV

Burma:

Mr. James BARRINGTON

U SEIN BWA

U HTOON SHEIN

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS

Mr. S.F. RAE

Mr. A.E. GOTLIEB

Mr. R.M. TAIT

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. L. SIMOVIC

Mr. M. ZEMLA

Mr. T. LAHODA

Ethiopia:

Ato Abate AGEDE

Ato S. TEFERRA

India:

Mr. R.K. NEHRU

Mr. A.S. NEHTA

Mr. K. KRISHNA RAO

Mr. K. NARENDRA NATH

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI

Mr. E. GUIDOTTI

Mr. S. AVETTA

Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

Mexico:

Mr. Ernesto de SANTIAGO
Mr. Manuel TELLO
Miss Ofelia REYES RETANA

Nigeria:

Mr. L.C.K. OBI

Poland:

Mr. M. NASZKOWSKI
Mr. M. BLUSZTAJN
Mr. E. STANIEWSKI
Mr. J. GOLDBLAT

Romania:

Mr. V. DUMITRESCU
Mr. E. GLASER
Mr. C. UNGUREANU
Mr. M. IONESCO

Sweden:

Mrs. A. MYRDAL
Mr. P. HAMMARSKJOLD
Mr. C. G. EKLUND
Mr. J. FRAWITZ

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. S. K. TSARAPKIN
Mr. A.A. ROSCHIN
Mr. I. G. USACHEV
Mr. V.V. SHUSTOV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. H. ISMAIL
Mr. AHMED OSMAN
Mr. M. KASSEM
Mr. S.E. IBRAHIM

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

United Kingdom:

Sir Paul MASON

Mr. J. G. TAHOURDIN

Mr. D. N. BRINSON

United States of America:

Mr. W.C. FOSTER

Mr. A.L. RICHARDS

Mr. D.S. MACDONALD

Mr. R.A. MARTIN

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

Deputy Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (Mexico) (translation from Spanish) : I declare open the one hundred and sixty-second meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Ato AGEDE (Ethiopia) : My delegation has listened with the greatest attention and interest to the statements made by the members of this Committee since the resumption of our present session. We share fully the sentiment, generally expressed in this Committee by every speaker who has preceded us, that our meetings have resumed at a time when the whole world is breathing more comfortably and hoping more than ever before that this somewhat relaxed international atmosphere will lead to a greater reduction of tension in relations among States and thus produce more substantial results in the field of general and complete disarmament than hitherto.

The aspiration reflected in the general sentiment to which I have alluded springs -- and this has been repeated by all the previous speakers -- from the fact that in the year just past the world has witnessed the concluding of certain important agreements favouring the creation of a better international climate. Although those agreements are essentially of a limited character, nevertheless very important gains were made by the signing of the treaty to ban nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water (ENDC/100/Rev.1), as well as by the unanimous endorsement by the United Nations General Assembly at its eighteenth session of the declaration of the intention of the two big Powers not to station in outer space or place in orbit any objects carrying nuclear weapons (A/RES/1884 (XVIII); ENDC/117). In addition, the establishment of a direct communication link between Moscow and Washington (ENDC/97) has been rightly hailed as a significant step towards the reduction of the danger of war by accident or miscalculation.

My delegation is also encouraged by the important messages addressed to this Committee by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant (ENDC/PV.157, pp.5,6), and President Johnson of the United States of America (ENDC/120). We should like to mention also the important proposals submitted to this Committee by the representative of the Soviet Union in the form of a memorandum (ENDC/123) at the 160th meeting of the Committee.

(Ato Agedo, Ethiopia)

At this point I should like to join the previous speakers in expressing my delegation's sincere appreciation to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, and the President of the United States, Mr. Johnson, who have sent us through their respective representatives, Mr. Protitch and Mr. Foster, their important messages.

I should like also to thank the representative of Canada, Mr. Burns -- who spoke in his capacity as Chairman of the first meeting of the current session of our Committee (ENDC/PV.157, p.7) --, the co-Chairmen, and the other representatives for the words of welcome they have extended to other new colleagues and to myself.

In his statement Mr. Foster (ibid., pp. 8,9) pointed out the loss that his country had suffered in the tragic death of President Kennedy. We fully share the sorrow and grief of the people and Government of the United States of America caused by the assassination of President Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy was a man who was dedicated to the cause of peace and to the well-being and prosperity of mankind. Consequently his loss was a loss not only to the people and Government of the United States but to the entire world.

After careful consideration of the important messages sent to this Committee by the Secretary-General of the United Nations (ENDC/116, 117) transmitting the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its eighteenth session, that of President Johnson (ENDC/120), and the proposals submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Tsarapkin, my delegation is encouraged to observe that there are several points of convergence of views which remove some of the obstacles to the achievement of the reduction of tension and thus lead to our ultimate goal: disarmament.

It appears to my delegation, going through the various proposals and statements made by members of this Committee, that before we start to tackle in a more concrete manner each and every one of these proposals, either separately or in conjunction with each other, it will indeed be very difficult to attribute accurately to them the importance they all deserve. Nevertheless we feel that the best way of proceeding with our work is that, while continuing to press on with renewed vigour with our examination in order to arrive at a wider area of agreement on the proposals for a draft treaty submitted by the Governments of the United States (ENDC/30 and Corr.1 and Add. 1, 2, 3) and of the Soviet Union (ENDC/2, Rev.1 and Add.1), for

(Ato Agedo, Ethiopia)

complete disarmament under strict international control, we should at the same time intensify our search for possibilities of implementing such partial measures as agreement on the need for the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests, the prevention of the dissemination of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons to nations not now possessing them, the physical destruction of some of the strategic weapons and the means of their delivery, and a substantial reduction in the military budgets of the armed Powers consistent with the requirements of their national security.

My delegation would like to recommend for the consideration of the Committee that we should also, simultaneously with those steps, endeavour to reach early agreement on such large confidence-building measures as the denuclearization of certain areas or regions, as well as the question of convening a conference for the purpose of signing a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, which latter measure the Ethiopian delegation sponsored at the United Nations as early as 1958. That proposal, adopted by an overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations at the eighteenth session of the General Assembly (A/RES/1909 (XVIII); ENDC/116), is now before this Committee for its consideration and action. We hope that the members of the Committee will understand that those suggestions were made in a spirit of co-operation and good will and are designed solely to contribute towards facilitating the work of our Committee.

In the same spirit, we should like to refer to the important speech of the representative of Sweden, Mrs. Myrdal, and we wish to recommend to the Committee that it give due consideration to her valuable suggestion which deals with the setting up of ad hoc working parties as outlined in her speech to the Committee at its 160th meeting on 28 January (ENDC/PV.160, pp. 17 et seq.)

In conclusion, I should like to assure the Committee that my delegation is always ready to contribute its full share to the important work of this Committee in order that we may achieve the greatest possible results during our present session.

Mr. NEHRU (India): As I am today speaking for the first time at this Conference, may I take the opportunity of thanking my colleagues who have been good enough to welcome me as the new head of the Indian delegation? I am conscious of the responsibility which all our delegations share, and I should like to assure my colleagues that the Indian delegation will continue its close and friendly collaboration with all other delegations in carrying out the great task which has been entrusted to us.

We resumed our work last week and have held a number of meetings in a very friendly atmosphere. I have listened with great interest and attention to the statements of my colleagues, and in my own statement today I should like to give the views of my delegation on some of the matters under discussion.

Before doing so, however, may I say a few words about another matter? I have not had an opportunity of doing so previously. Since our last session five months ago, a tragic and distressing event has taken place. The world has lost a great leader who, in the words of Prime Minister Nehru:

"...endeavoured, not without success, to work for the removal of the tensions that burden and distract the world and to ensure an abiding peace."

President Kennedy was, in a sense, one of the architects of our own Conference. Our loss is therefore all the greater, and the Indian delegation wishes to associate itself with other delegations in paying tribute to the memory of the late President.

With regard to the matters under discussion at our Conference, I shall not at present go into much detail. We are still at the stage of general discussion and are trying to clarify some of our ideas. Occasions will arise later for more detailed discussions, or for discussion in greater depth. Therefore I propose to confine myself today to some broad aspects of our work.

There are two aspects upon which our attention has been focussed in this Conference -- first, the change which has taken place in the international situation and the new possibilities which that has created for us; secondly, the concrete steps which might be taken at our present session in the light of those possibilities to ensure some progress in our work.

(Mr. Nehru, India)

As we all know, when our Committee was set up two years ago great hopes were aroused, more particularly in the less-developed countries. There were hopes that we might be able to contribute towards the ending of the arms race, the removal of the threat to peace, and the utilization of resources for more productive purposes. These are the major problems facing the world today -- the danger of war, and the tensions created by the hunger and poverty of hundreds of millions. It was expected that our Conference would help in finding a solution or advancing towards a solution of those problems. For the first year or so, however, not much progress was made at the Conference. That was a source of acute disappointment which led in some quarters to a loss of interest in our work. It was, of course, recognized, as has been stated in this Conference also, that conflicting national and security interests, lack of trust and other factors are an obstacle to rapid progress. However, the arms race itself creates insecurity and other dangers, and it is the overriding interest of all nations that the work which has been entrusted to us should be brought to a successful conclusion at the earliest possible date.

Happily, some new developments have now taken place which have helped to create a better atmosphere. It was in this Conference that ideas were first mooted which led to the agreements of last year. The three agreements which have been reached are not on disarmament measures. There are some nations which have refused to sign one of these agreements -- the agreement on the partial test ban. One of those nations, China, has denounced the agreement in violent terms. Nevertheless the agreements have been welcomed by the world community as a whole. They are steps on the road to disarmament and have brought about a striking improvement in the international atmosphere.

Other steps have been taken which have helped to reinforce this improvement. Some are unilateral steps which have been taken on the basis of what Chairman Khrushchev has described as "a policy of reciprocal example" (ENDC/118, p.5). Both the Soviet Union and the United States have made cuts in their military budgets. There also seems to be some possibility of a reduction in the level of armed forces.

(Mr. Nehru, India)

Apart from those steps, important declarations of policy have been made by the world leaders. . President Johnson has reaffirmed his intention of continuing the policy of the Kennedy Administration. He has stressed the need for peace based on disarmament and the ending of the "cold war" (ENDC/PV.157, pp. 9,10). Chairman Khrushchev has made similar statements which show his firm adherence to a policy of peace and peaceful coexistence.

All these are heartening developments which should help us greatly in our work. They have created new possibilities and an impetus towards larger agreements. The problem which faces us today is how to keep that impetus alive. That is not merely a problem, but it is also a challenge which we must meet. The next few months are of crucial importance, for if there is lack of progress in our work the earlier gains may be lost. That might easily create a setback in the international situation. Thus a great responsibility rests on us to take some constructive steps which will add to the earlier gains and strengthen the new trends that are developing.

In this context, Secretary-General U Thant has also sent us a message. We thank him for the message, which was read to us by his Special Representative (ibid., pp.5, 6). The Secretary-General has referred to the atmosphere of détente which exists at present and has expressed the view that it should be possible for us to take additional concrete steps. He has also drawn our attention (ENDC/116, 117) to the five resolutions on disarmament which were adopted by the General Assembly. Those resolutions set out what he has described as our specific responsibilities in the present session. The more important resolutions relate to the drafting of a treaty on disarmament, the conclusion of an agreement on a comprehensive test ban, and agreements on collateral or tension-reducing measures. We have been asked to resume our negotiations with a sense of urgency and with energy and determination. The Secretary-General has stated his own conviction that in the auspicious circumstances now prevailing our Conference will make a major effort, taking full advantage of the favourable atmosphere, and that the resumption of the Conference will provide the occasion for the presentation of new proposals and for new ideas and approaches by all the parties.

(Mr. Nehru, India)

Some new proposals have already been presented, and there are also many old proposals. Some of those proposals have still to take a concrete shape. They have been placed before our Conference in the shape of ideas. However, it might be convenient to refer to them as proposals. Thus there are five proposals contained in President Johnson's message to the Conference (ENDC/120) and nine proposals in the Soviet memorandum (ENDC/123). We have fourteen proposals before us which relate to various aspects of the work of our Conference. Some relate to measures of disarmament, others relate to the test ban, and the rest relate to collateral or tension-reducing measures. There is also the proposal made by our United Kingdom colleague for improving our procedure and methods of work (ENDC/FV.157, pp.24 et seq.).

While examining all these proposals in the light of the explanations given by some of our colleagues and the comments made by others, both of which are of great value, the Indian delegation has kept in mind some basic considerations. First, our objectives have been defined in the General Assembly resolutions, and any new steps that we might take must naturally fit in with these objectives. Secondly, any such steps, unless they are unilateral steps, must necessarily be based on an agreement, which means that our approach has to be flexible. Full consideration should be given to the point of view and interests of each party, and the door should be kept open for friendly negotiations. Thirdly, while the ultimate objective is clear, and our efforts must be directed to reaching an agreement on general and complete disarmament at the earliest possible date, it is also vitally important to maintain and strengthen the present trend towards a détente.

The Indian delegation therefore agrees with the views which have been expressed by many other delegations regarding the importance of unilateral measures and an early agreement on any measure, however small, which is ripe for agreement and is consistent with our larger objectives.

I should like now to explain briefly the views of my delegation on some of the proposals which have been placed before us. Many of the proposals need fuller clarification, and some adjustments will no doubt be made in the course of further negotiations. There is no finality, therefore, about the views of our delegation. We shall look forward to taking part in both formal and informal discussions. Our basic approach is to help in bringing about agreements.

(Mr. Nehru, India)

I should like first to deal with the question of procedure. My reason for doing so is that both in this Conference and in the debates in the General Assembly there has been some criticism of our procedure. Not only Western representatives but also representatives of the socialist countries and of the non-aligned countries have complained that the procedure tends to be unbusinesslike. I recall the comment of Mr. Gromyko (A/PV.1208, provisional, p.67) that there are too many general statements and a continuous flow of words.

How are we to make the procedure more businesslike, so as to ensure that the words are followed by quick and practical results? That is our basic problem. Our United Kingdom colleague has suggested (ENDC/PV.157, pp. 24 et seq.) that the time has come to consider the possibility of reducing the number of formal debates and to enter into factual and objective discussions. He has proposed the setting up of working groups for examining the technical aspects of key problems. The working groups, he has explained, would merely assist the Committee and would in no way detract from its political responsibility. The representative of Czechoslovakia has pointed out (ENDC/PV.158, p.17) that an agreement must first be reached in principle. After that there should be no objection to discussions at a technical level.

We have studied all of those remarks carefully, and we feel that on the question of strengthening our procedure some agreement should be possible. The solution suggested by the representative of Sweden at our meeting on 28 January (ENDC/PV.160, pp.17 et seq.), and by the representative of Burma yesterday (ENDC/PV.161, p.9) seem to us to merit consideration. We should be glad to hear the views of other delegations on the subject, and we hope that some solution will be evolved in the course of further discussions.

As regards matters of substance, our main task in this Conference is to reach an agreement on general and complete disarmament. At previous sessions there has been a great deal of general discussion on the terms of the draft treaty. There are two drafts before us, and some progress has been made in narrowing the gap in regard to some matters. There are other matters, however, which are still to be discussed. A particularly important matter is the nature of the peace-keeping machinery.

(Mr. Nehru, India)

The crux of the problem, however, lies in the steps to be taken in regard to nuclear armaments. Happily, in this field also there is some narrowing of the gap. The Soviet Union has made a new proposal relating to a "nuclear umbrella" (ENDC/2/Rev.1/Add.1). We consider this to be an important contribution which should help to speed up our work on the drafting of a treaty. The Western Powers have asked for a fuller clarification of the proposal. In the absence of more details, they are unable to accept the proposal in principle. We hope that in the course of further negotiations during the present session some of the doubts which exist will be removed. There is a difference of opinion concerning which should come first -- an agreement in principle, or clarification of matters of detail. We hope that further negotiations will help to bring about some agreement on the way of handling the problem of delivery vehicles. It is one of the tasks of our Conference to promote an agreement. As progress is made towards such an agreement, conditions will no doubt be created for a fuller clarification of matters of detail. We feel that informal discussions on such matters could also help in clarifying the remaining points of doubt.

The second major task assigned to our Conference is to continue negotiations for bringing about an agreement on the suspension of underground tests. The urgent need for such an agreement is universally recognized. This task has also been included in both the Soviet and the United States lists of proposals which have been placed before us (ENDC/123, 120). We are aware, of course, of the differences which exist on the question of inspection. However, the two nuclear Powers have declared their intention to continue negotiations for the discontinuance of all tests. We wonder if, at the present session, some indication will be given to us of the results of their negotiations. At some time or other this question will have to be taken up, since we have been asked (A/RES/1910(XVIII); ENDC/116) to continue our negotiations with a sense of high urgency and to make a report to the General Assembly. In the course of these negotiations we might perhaps consider some of the suggestions which were made by representatives of non-aligned countries at the last session of the General Assembly, as well as at previous sessions of our Conference, with a view to obviating difficulties in regard to inspection.

(Mr. Nehru, India)

In conclusion I should like to say a few words about collateral, or tension-reducing measures. Many such measures have been included in both the Soviet and the United States lists of proposals which have been submitted to us. Apart from those measures, there are also some disarmament measures and Mr. Khrushchev's proposal for an agreement on the renunciation of force in the settlement of territorial disputes. I propose to deal very briefly with those proposals.

As I have stated already, my delegation attaches great importance to collateral measures, more particularly at the present time. Agreements on such measures would help to bring about a further improvement in the international atmosphere. All such measures are to be welcomed, and we hope that it will be possible to reach an agreement on as many as possible. Further discussions, both formal and informal, will no doubt show on which measures early agreement can be reached.

My delegation has no rigid views on the question of priorities. We feel, however, that the following measures should receive early consideration: non-dissemination of nuclear weapons; a verified nuclear freeze; the halting of the production of fissionable material; and measures for the prevention of surprise attack. Some of the proposals which have been made in regard to those measures need fuller clarification. We shall consider the proposals again after they have been clarified. Measures for the prevention of surprise attack seem to have been accepted in principle by both great Powers. It might be easier to reach an agreement in practice if progress were made simultaneously on some interrelated proposals.

In the past my delegation has fully supported the proposal for a non-aggression treaty between the two military alliances (ENDC/77). There is no change in our attitude on this question. With regard to the other proposals, I should like to say that we have noted the proposal for a cut in military budgets and armed forces and the elimination of air-force bombers. All those proposals are contained in the Soviet list (ENDC/123). Some of them need fuller clarification, and this will no doubt be given later. There are only a few preliminary comments I should like to make on those proposals at this stage. We presume that the intention is to limit the applicability of those measures for the present to the great Powers. Powers which are militarily weaker and are exposed to threats of aggression cannot easily implement such proposals. However, any step in the direction of physical disarmament, whether big or small, is to be welcomed.

(Mr. Nehru, India)

Finally, I should like to say a word about the message sent by Mr. Khrushchev on 31 December 1963 to all Heads of State. The contents of the message are well known, and I do not intend to repeat them. As it is possible that Mr. Khrushchev's proposal and the proposal made later by President Johnson for an agreement on the renunciation of force (ENDC/120) may form the subject of a fuller discussion in our Conference, I shall quote a brief extract from Prime Minister Nehru's reply to Mr. Khrushchev's letter. This extract, which indicates the attitude of the Government of India to this question, is as follows:

"The Government of India welcome your initiative and broadly agree with the approach in your proposals. We have always maintained that the use of force does not solve any problem, and we believe that all Governments should agree to renounce the use of force for settling territorial differences or questions of frontiers and also undertake to withdraw to the historical boundaries where these have been altered by force in recent years. An agreement among nations in this behalf, we are convinced, would lead to a reduction of tensions and constitute yet another step towards the building of international confidence, which is essential if purposeful progress is to be made towards a treaty on general and complete disarmament."

Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): We have listened this morning with great interest to the presentations by the representatives of Ethiopia and India, as we listened yesterday to those of the representatives of Burma and the United Arab Republic (ENDC/PV.161, pp. 5 et seq., 10 et seq.). I can assure the Conference and those representatives that we will study those statements with great care. I should also like to thank all four representatives, as I have already thanked others, on behalf of my Government, on behalf of the Kennedy family, and on my own behalf, for the expressions of sympathy which they have offered here.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

I wish also to express, on behalf of my delegation, our determination to take advantage of the better atmosphere and the convergence, at least to a certain degree, of the views on some of our problems, to which our two speakers this morning particularly have referred.

I should like to devote the balance of my remarks today to the second point of President Johnson's message to this Conference (ENDC/120). As you will recall, he proposed that the United States, the Soviet Union and their respective allies should agree to explore a verified freeze of the number and characteristics of strategic nuclear offensive and defensive vehicles.

This proposal is patterned after measures which have already been successfully negotiated, measures having a common general philosophy. This philosophy is that a logical first step is to freeze things where they are and thereby remove future obstacles to disarmament. This philosophy lay behind the Antarctic Treaty, which was easier to achieve because Antarctica was still free of armaments. It lay behind the resolution against nuclear weapons in orbit, (A/RES/1884(XVIII); ENDC/117), which was easier to achieve because space was still free of weapons of mass destruction.

To a large degree this philosophy lay behind the test ban Treaty also (ENDC/100/Rev.1). That Treaty imposes severe limits upon the testing and, as a result, the development of larger nuclear weapons. As one of the United States nuclear experts put it in his testimony to the United States Senate:

"In the very large weapon area, where the USSR, I believe, is ahead of the United States, little further progress could be made by either country under the Treaty".

The United States accepted this limitation mainly because we did not feel the need for very large nuclear weapons and wished to put an end to the race to make them larger and larger. We felt that the easiest way to disarmament was to stop this part of the arms race and to turn around so that we could begin going back in the direction from whence we had come. In this sense, the treaty was clearly a "freeze".

President Johnson's second point would be a "freeze" in the same sense. It would halt the race for more and better strategic nuclear vehicles and open the

(Mr. Foster, United States)

path to reductions from present levels in all types of forces. Where the test ban Treaty limited warhead size, and the United States proposal for a fissionable material cut-off would limit the amount of explosive materials available for warheads, the present proposal would limit numbers and characteristics of strategic nuclear vehicles.

For many years -- even while this Conference has been in session -- both sides have increased the numbers of their strategic nuclear vehicles to a substantial extent. In so doing, both have simply added to the amounts of their materials of war which must be destroyed if disarmament is to be achieved. To achieve it, we must stop the increases above present levels, increases which seem inevitable in the absence of agreement.

Two months before his death, President Kennedy said:

"For too long both of us have increased our military budgets, our nuclear stockpiles and our capacity to destroy all life -- human, animal, vegetable -- without any corresponding increase in our security"

President Johnson's "freeze" proposal is a major step to halt this process at present levels in a way which actually could be carried out in a reasonable period of time.

The representative of Canada described the purpose of the freeze as follows at our meeting held on 23 January:

"Between the phase of building up armaments and the hoped-for phase of reducing armaments, there has to be a point of time at which you stop -- like changing the movement of a motor-car from forward to backward". (ENDC/PV.158, p.11).

Our Italian colleague made a similar point on 28 January:

"In order to achieve disarmament, the first step must be to put a stop to the armaments race. That is self-evident." (ENDC/PV.160, p.29).

Yesterday the representative of the United Arab Republic put it this way:

"To halt the arms race is probably a most important prelude to disarmament. Perhaps the simplest way to achieve that result would be to make a verified halt of the development and production of armaments and to shut down the plants. Nuclear weapons and their vehicles of delivery should take first priority in this respect." (ENDC/PV.161, p.13).

(Mr. Foster, United States)

President Johnson said: "The best way to begin disarming is to begin ---" (ENDC/120, p.2). To do so, we must stop going in the direction we have been going and turn around. This would make steps in the direction of disarmament --- steps involving physical destruction of armaments --- more meaningful. That was a point the representative of Burma made yesterday (ENDC/PV.161, p.7). As President Johnson said, this method would "open the path to reductions in all types of forces from present levels". (ENDC/120, p.2).

The best place to begin is with strategic nuclear vehicles. We have singled them out for three reasons. We believe first attention should be directed to the long-range weapons of greatest destructiveness. We believe a freeze on these weapons can be achieved with effective inspection requirements which would be less than those required for a general and complete disarmament programme limiting all major armaments across the board. Finally, we believe we should focus on these weapons because they are among the most expensive to develop and produce.

The Soviet Union has long urged that we begin disarming with nuclear delivery vehicles. Moreover, in several statements Premier Khrushchev has made the point that long-range rockets with nuclear tips are the most destructive weapons. He did so, for example, in speeches on 14 January 1960 to the Supreme Soviet; to a Moscow election rally on 16 March 1962; and to the Moscow Congress for General Disarmament and Peace on 10 July 1962. There have been claims by both sides to superiority in strategic nuclear forces. Regardless of which side is ahead, these are the weapons which appear most threatening to all countries.

We suggest that the specifics of the freeze be explored by allies on both sides before detailed negotiations are undertaken. For our part, of course, we would give weight to the general reaction which delegations may wish to express here in the near future. To assist in their consideration, we suggest that the following be explored:

First, the freeze should, we believe, include strategic missiles and aircraft. The categories of weapons affected should be defined along lines of range and weight. For this measure, the categories suggested in stage I of the United States outline of 18 April 1962 (ENDC/30, pp. 4, 5), should be adjusted, we think,

(Mr. Foster, United States)

for several reasons. For instance, there have been changes in technology since those earlier categories were proposed. Moreover, the freeze would include only strategic categories; and it could be implemented before agreement on general and complete disarmament.

Secondly, the United States believes the freeze should also include anti-ballistic missile systems. A freeze on strategic delivery systems without a freeze on anti-missile systems would be destabilizing and therefore unacceptable.

Thirdly, the immediate objective of the freeze on numbers should be to maintain the quantities of strategic nuclear vehicles held by the East and the West at constant levels. As we see it, the agreement should provide for a suitable number of missile tests without warheads to ensure that missile systems continue to be reliable over a period of time. For this and related purposes, it should also provide for production of replacements on a one-for-one basis: one missile produced for one destroyed. This should not, of course, permit any increase by either side in the constant level which it is the purpose of the agreement to maintain.

Fourthly, the objective of the freeze on characteristics should be, the United States believes, to prevent the development and deployment of strategic vehicles of a significantly new type. Like the freeze on numbers, this should apply to defensive as well as offensive vehicles. The significance of this provision might well be greater than that of the freeze on numbers. It would halt the race to produce better strategic vehicles to carry bigger warheads. It would mean an end to the qualitative as well as to the quantitative strategic arms race.

Fifthly, as I have already indicated, we have singled out strategic vehicles partly because we believe that the verification requirements would be less onerous than for a production freeze on the entire range of major armaments included within our general and complete disarmament plan. One possible means of verifying the freeze would be to monitor significant existing production and testing facilities which each side would declare, and to provide for a specified number of spot checks to guard against possible undeclared facilities. That is an example of the kind of verification requirement we have in mind. Additional problems would remain. However, we believe verification can be effective without being burdensome. We hope that a system acceptable to all concerned could be worked out.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

The freeze we wish to explore would have important advantages for all States. It would curb a key area of the arms race; it would inhibit development of costly, new and more destructive weapon systems; it would be an accomplishment far beyond any "confidence building" measure in significance, yet one that could be achieved in a reasonable period of time; it would lay a firm basis for the achievement of the balanced reductions contemplated in the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles (ENDC/5); it would tend to reduce any fears which may exist that either side could achieve a decisive first-strike capability; it would permit significant reduction of military expenditures; it would help to reduce tensions and accelerate the forward movement towards general disarmament.

My delegation would be grateful for initial reactions to this idea to assist us in exploring it further. We believe it holds great promise.

In future meetings I will be discussing other points in President Johnson's message (ENDC/120). Each of the five points in that message can be implemented separately or with any of the other points. Each is important to our work here. All are possible of achievement.

The CHAIRMAN (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): This Conference has resumed its work amidst enthusiastic expressions of approval, hope and optimism. We feel, we have the strong conviction based on indisputable evidence, that our former attitude of sorrow defeat and despair has disappeared. That is plain from the very air we breathe. There seems a definite probability that we shall be able to reach fresh and more complete agreements that will increasingly reduce the prospects of warlike conflict.

We have only to recall the agreement to establish a direct telephone line between the President of the United States of America and the Soviet Prime Minister (ENDC/97); the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water (ENDC/100/Rev.1); and the agreement to refrain from putting nuclear weapons into orbit (A/RES/1884 (XVIII)) (ENDC/117). All these agreements are definite steps that mankind has been able to take along the road to general and complete disarmament under direct international control.

(The Chairman, Mexico)

In consequence, the Mexican delegation will always eagerly and diligently search for points that might bring together the nuclear Powers in united action and thought, in order that the world may be freed from the virtual state of siege in which it is living. We have carefully considered the invitation of the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union to draw up in concert an agreement on the elimination of force as a means of settling territorial disputes. We have also given close and careful attention to the points made by the President of the United States of America in his eloquent message to this Committee delivered at our 157th meeting by Mr. Foster (ENDC/120)

In both proposals for the elimination of force as a means of settling territorial disputes my delegation has noted a number of valuable elements which may be expected to facilitate the important task with which we have been entrusted.

Netherless, we must declare our profound conviction that any such agreement must be accompanied, as an essential complement, by an international agreement providing for compulsory arbitration as the last resort for the peaceful settlement of disputes. It was in this sense that the Minister for Foreign Affairs for my country spoke in his statement to this Disarmament Committee on 22 March 1962 (ENDC/PV.7, p.5).

My delegation has noted and is studying with the greatest interest the memorandum which Mr. Tsarapkin submitted on behalf of his Government (ENDC/123), and to which we listened with close attention at the 160th meeting of this Committee.

The Mexican delegation also considers resolution 1911 (XVIII) (ENDC/117), adopted by the United Nations General Assembly concerning the denuclearization of Latin America, to be a positive step towards disarmament. That resolution has a particular value, not only because it aims at safeguarding a whole geographical region from the dangers inherent in a nuclear conflict-- in accordance with the proposals contained in the Declaration made by the Presidents of Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador and Mexico on 29 April 1963 (ENDC/87) -- but also because it is based on the idea that the denuclearization of a particular region of the world must inevitably depend on the voluntary consent of the States in that region, or at least of a large majority of them.

(The Chairman, Mexico)

The Mexican delegation has listened with the greatest interest to the ideas expressed by the various representatives and will continue to do so. We hope and trust that every member of the Committee will submit ideas which will give a powerful impetus to the discussions for the promotion of general and complete disarmament, the concrete symbol of the supreme hope of mankind. We shall not hesitate to give our support to any positive and constructive proposals that we consider likely to lead us to the achievement of our goal.

The work entrusted to this Eighteen-Nation Committee is arousing unprecedented interest in the world today; we are at the meeting place of all the currents of world opinion, and the proposals we are discussing are scrutinized at all levels of society. That at any rate is true of my country and of many others in Latin America. The future will say whether we shall be able here to make the difficult easy, the unjust just, the inequitable equitable. Sometimes there may be very little confidence, perhaps too little, and we of the neutral countries who are working here with only words as our tools wish to bring out the overwhelming importance of action; one deed is worth a million words. But in order to be effective, action must be complete; it must be something indisputable and manifest — and that is what we are hoping from this Conference.

In accordance with the decision taken by the Committee at its first meeting with regard to procedure, (ENDC/PV.157, p.38), the next meeting on Tuesday will be devoted to the study of general and complete disarmament.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 162nd plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of H.E. Mr. E. de Santiago, Minister Plenipotentiary and Representative of Mexico.

"Statements were made by the Representatives of Ethiopia, India, the United States and Mexico.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 4 February 1964, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.